

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 33-38 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1-32 have been withdrawn from consideration. In the instant Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 33-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,442,546 to Biliris et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Applicants have amended claims 33 and 36 to state that the mapping module is operative to "stream additional record chunks to the second client node as they are received from the first client node." As such, the claimed subject matter is directed to a messaging system that streams record chunks associated with a given record (which includes a unique identifier) to one or more subscribing nodes.

Biliris fails to disclose the claimed subject matter. Biliris teaches a messaging system where message attributes are defined and modified by external messaging applications. See Biliris, Col. 1, lines 38-48. In Biliris, folders are associated with users, messages are associated with folders. Biliris, Col. 4, lines 1-10. That is, messages sent to users are associated with folders corresponding to recipient users. Biliris, Col. 4, lines 20-24. Each received message, however, is associated with a unique identifier. See Biliris, Col. 5, lines 9-10, and Col. 5, lines 49-51. In contrast, each received record chunk corresponds to an existing record and, thus, is associated with the unique identifier that corresponds to that record. In other words, multiple record chunks can be associated with the same identifier, whereas, in Biliris, each received message includes a unique identifier. Furthermore, Biliris does not teach a system that streams record chunks to client nodes.

Claims 34 and 36 have also been amended to state that the mapping module is

operative to "synchronize the record attribute values in the at least one index map with record attribute values of at least one index map maintained by the at least one other distributed data repository nodes." The Examiner, citing Biliris, Col. 3, lines 13-15, appears to allege that Biliris teaches this subject matter. Biliris merely teaches that message attribute information may be stored across multiple messaging servers; however, Biliris does not teach that the synchronization of index maps across nodes.

Furthermore, Biliris does not anticipate claims 35 and 37. The subject matter according to these claims is directed to transmitting record chunks to other nodes for replication. As the specification describes, this replication creates a fault tolerant system that is capable of addressing node failures. The passage cited by the Examiner (Biliris, Col. 5, 63-65) merely states that a received message is "passed to a message store, where it is stored, given a message identifier, and then 'exposed' through the transaction manager to any core services that may wish to extract and index message attributes." Neither this cited passage, nor the remainder of Biliris, teach transmission of record chunks to other repository nodes for replication.

Lastly, despite the Examiner's allegations, Biliris does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 38. As set forth above, claim 38 states that "each distributed data repository node is further operative to request and receive from at least one other distributed data repository node record chunks that match a query received from a client node." Furthermore, given the mapping engine is operative to synchronize index maps of each data repository node, the claimed subject matter discloses a system of data repository nodes having synchronized index maps and subsets of record chunks. To satisfy a query where the requested record chunks are stored remotely, the data repository nodes are operative to request the matching record chunks for other nodes. Biliris fails to teach the

claimed subject matter. Rather, the passages cited by the Examiner merely teach that 1) attributes are associated with folders, users and messages using unique attribute identifiers (Biliris, Col. 4, lines 9-10); and 2) Biliris' system supports basic access functions that return identifiers matching a specified attribute value (Col. 5, lines 43-45). The Examiner fails to explain, however, how these teachings disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter, wherein data repository nodes request and receive record chunks from other data repository nodes.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that all currently pending claims are presently in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that any further action by Applicant is necessary to place this application in condition for allowance, Applicants request a telephone conference with the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully Submitted,
LAW OFFICE OF MARK J. SPOLYAR
By

/Mark J. Spolyar/
Mark J. Spolyar
Reg. No. 42,164

Date: December 28, 2006

Customer Number: 30505
Law Office of Mark J. Spolyar
2200 Cesar Chavez St., Suite 8
San Francisco, CA 94124
415-826-7966
415-480-1780 fax